UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,087	03/22/2004	Rajan Rajendran	0315-000505/REA	1688
	10/806,087 03/22/2004 Rajan Rajendran	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 828			RODRIGUEZ, WILLIAM H	
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3746	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant/a)		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
fice Action Commercia	10/806,087	RAJENDRAN ET AL.		
fice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	William H. Rodríguez/	3746		
MAILING DATE of this communication a ly	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address		
NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI R IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR IONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. or reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per y within the set or extended period for reply will, by statived by the Office later than three months after the matern adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a replant Fried will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH atute, cause the application to become ABAN	ATION. ly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
	•			
onsive to communication(s) filed on 19	9 April 2007.			
This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal matter	s, prosecution as to the merits is		
I in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Claims				
(s) <u>1-29,71,75-95,97,99-102,104-106</u>	and 108-120 is/are pending in	the application.		
the above claim(s) is/are withd	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, ,		
(s) is/are allowed.				
(s) <u>1-29,71,75-95,97,99-102,104-106</u>	and 108-120 is/are rejected.			
(s) is/are objected to.				
(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.			
pers				
ecification is objected to by the Exam	iner.			
awing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ a	accepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.		
ant may not request that any objection to t	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
ement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, ,		
th or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-152.		
85 U.S.C. § 119				
wledgment is made of a claim for forei b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).		
Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.			
Certified copies of the priority docume	• •			
	-	eceived in this National Stage		
	` ' ' '	popiyad		
attached detailed Office action for a l	ist of the certified copies not re	ceiveu.		
01/4 (PTS 222)				
	4) ∐ Interview Sun Paper No(s)/I	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date		
isclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Info	mal Patent Application		
b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority docume Certified copies of the priority docume Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure attached detailed Office action for a least serior of the priority docume attached detailed Office action for a least serior of the priority documents attached detailed Office action for a least serior of the priority documents attached detailed Office action for a least serior of the priority documents are priority documents.	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apportionity documents have been releau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). list of the certified copies not re	olication No eceived in this National Stage eceived. mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date		

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment and remarks filed 1/25/02. In making the below rejections, the examiner has considered and addressed each of the applicants arguments.

Specification

1. The specification is objected to because: Changes were made to the original patent by a Certificate of Correction on 3/3/04, which is prior to the filing of the reissue. The applicant has failed to incorporate into the reissue application the changes made to the specification and claims by this certificate. Certificate of Correction changes and disclaimer of claim(s) under 37 CFR 1.321(a) should be made without using underlining or brackets. Since these are part of the original patent and were made before the reissue was filed, they should show up in the printed reissue patent document as part of the original patent, i.e., not in italics or bracketed. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: Changes were made to the original patent by a Certificate of Correction on 3/3/04, which is prior to the filing of the reissue. The applicant has failed to incorporate into the reissue application the changes made to the specification and claims by this certificate. Certificate of Correction changes and disclaimer of claim(s) under 37 CFR 1.321(a) should be made without using underlining or brackets. Since these are part of the original patent and were made before the reissue was filed, they should show up in the printed reissue patent document as part of the original patent, i.e., not in italics or bracketed. Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/806,087 Page 3

Art Unit: 3746

3. Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened

claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present

reissue is based. See Pannu v. Storz Instruments Inc., 258 F.3d 1366, 59 USPO2d 1597 (Fed.

Cir. 2001); Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc., 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir.

1998); In re Clement, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); Ball Corp. v. United

States, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is

present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the

application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to claim

subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application.

Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of

35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope of claim subject matter surrendered in the application for

the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

There appears to be an issue of possible recapture regarding the phrase/claim limitation of the

"suction pressure zone". This limitation was added in the original patent by the amendment filed on 7/3/03

and was additionally argued by the applicant in the accompanying remarks as basis for the claimed

invention defining over the applied art. The applicant has now attempted to remove this limitation in at

least some instances from newly presented claim 76.

Oath or Declaration Defective

4. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37

CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See

MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It was not executed in accordance with either 37 CFR 1.66 or 1.68.

Application/Control Number: 10/806,087 Page 4

Art Unit: 3746

5. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because the error which is relied upon to support the reissue application is not an error upon which a reissue can be based. See 37 CFR 1.175(a)(1) and MPEP § 1414.

- 6. Claims 1-29, 71, 75-95, 97, 99-102, 104-106 and 108-120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being improperly broadened in a reissue application made and sworn to by the assignee and not the patentee. A claim is broader in scope than the original claims if it contains within its scope any conceivable product or process which would have infringed the original patent. A claim is broadened if it is broader in any one respect even though it may be narrower in other respects.
- 7. Claims 1-29, 71, 75-95, 97, 99-102, 104-106 and 108-120 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue oath or declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the oath or declaration is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

First, only two inventors are indicated on the oath yet the patent has three listed inventors. Carl H. Knapke is not listed at all.

Second, the specific statement of error is not sufficient for multiple reasons. First, since this is broadening, the applicant needs to state as such here but has failed to do so. Also, applicant currently indicates that one error is that they "did not claim the subject matter of an oil sump disposed along a cylindrical sidewall..." however as this limitation is only presented as a dependent claim, it is not sufficient basis for a reissuable error. Next, applicant indicates that they did not claim the subject matter of claim 30 in communication with the mounting frame assembly, discharge pressure chamber, capacity modulation, variable speed motor, fluid injection, eccentric crank pin, suction inlet, oil pump, and end caps. This is also not sufficient error: there is no claim currently pending that incorporates claim 30 and all of these listed elements; therefore if this is really an error, it has still not been fixed and is insufficient basis for the reissue. Applicant must provide a specific statement of error that accurately describes an error sufficient for reissue that is in fact being corrected by the reissue; applicant must identify a single word, phrase, or expression in the specification or in an original claim, and how it renders the original patent wholly or partly inoperative or invalid (i.e. is too broad/narrow) and must do so with specific reference to a specific phrase/expression and a specific original claim.

Application/Control Number: 10/806,087 Page 5

Art Unit: 3746

Third, this appears to be a broadening reissue in that the claims are broader in at least one respect as compared to the scope of the claims of the patent; a broadening reissue application must be applied for by all of the inventors (patentees) and the oath must be signed by all inventors. In this instance, applicant has filed a declaration by the assignee which is not acceptable in a broadening reissue.

Contact information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to /William H. Rodríguez/ whose telephone number is 571-272-

4831. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on 571-272-4561. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William H. Rodríguez/ **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 3746